



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

[Handwritten Signature]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,354	07/02/2001	Pekka Ketola	460-010421-US(PAR)	8266
2512	7590	08/29/2007	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			LIN, WEN TAI	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2154		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		08/29/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/897,354	KETOLA, PEKKA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wen-Tai Lin	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/9/2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-6,8,10-13,15,17-20,22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 3-6, 8, 10-13, 15, 17-20 and 22-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-13, 15, 17-20 and 22-23 are presented for examination.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

35 U.S. 103 Rejection

3. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-13, 15, 17-20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lager et al.(hereafter "Lager") [U.S. Pat. No. 6636502] in view of Official Notice.
4. Lager was cited in the previous office action.
5. As to claim 1, Lager teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a system for controlling at least two remote mailboxes, located in at least two e-mail servers [Abstract; col. 19 lines 21-31 and 45-58] comprising:
at least a first connection of a packet data system between a wireless terminal [e.g., a GPRS-MS] and an e-mail server maintaining a first remote mailbox [e.g., col. 13, lines 36-37; i.e., use the NIP parameter to specify an AOL's email session using the first

PDP connection]; and a second connection of the packet data system between the wireless terminal and another terminal station using the second PDP connection [e.g., [col.19, lines 45-58; note that GPRS-MS and ISP are example of terminal stations (PTE) --see Fig.11].

Lager does not specifically teach maintaining two remote mailboxes with the first and second connections simultaneously.

However, Official Notice is taken that it is well known for an Internet user to launch two browser instances (e.g., by clicking on the same browser icon twice) to create two browser windows displaying side-by-side on the same display system.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to access and display two different mailboxes using Lager's first and second PDP connections because showing the mailboxes side-by-side on a same window makes it easier for the user to continuously monitor the statuses of the mailboxes.

6. As to claim 3, Lager further teaches that an e-mail program [e.g., a browser] is arranged to be used for controlling said remote mailboxes, which e-mail program is provided with the capability to control several remote mailboxes substantially simultaneously, and in which each remote mailbox is provided with a unique identification [e.g., col.19, lines 21-31; note that it is well known that subscribers of the

AOL and CompuServe are provided with individual mailboxes associated with their accounts].

7. As to claim 4, Lager further teaches that a notification of an e-mail message that has arrived in one of said remote mailboxes is arranged to be produced for the user, wherein in that said notification is arranged to be provided with a unique identification of that remote mailbox to which the e-mail message has arrived [e.g., col. 19, lines 21-24; note that the PDP type parameter serves as a unique identifier for the information coming from different sources (e.g., 100=AOL; 101= CompuServe)].

8. As to claims 5-6, by Official Notice it is further submitted that a browser user has access to e-mail program (provided by the service provider) with the capability to formulate and send e-mail messages, wherein the e-mail address of the user is automatically attached to the e-mail message [note that this is an inherent function of the email program].

9. As to claims 8, 10-13, 15, 17-20 and 22-23, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1 and 3-6, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 3-6 above.

10. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/9/2007 for claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-13, 15, 17-20 and 22-23 have been respectfully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

11. In the remarks Applicant argues that there is no disclosure of suggestion that each browser instance as suggested by the examiner in the office action is a different instance. Further, Applicant requests evidentiary basis to support for creating two different PDP connections in a combination as claimed by Applicant.

12. The examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's arguments as follows:

Lager clearly teaches at least at col. 19, lines 45-58 that a GPRS-MS terminal station can simultaneously connect to two other terminal stations (PTEs), such as ISPs (see Fig.11 where in GPRS-MS and ISP/PDN are examples of terminal stations). At col.13, lines 36-37 Lager further teaches that one may use the network indication parameter (NIP) to specify an ISP (such as AOL) for an email session. Thus, it is clearly feasible, in view of Lager's teachings, to connect a GPRS-MS terminal with two mailboxes via two respective ISP servers. The only thing missing from Lager's teachings is a motivation for maintaining/displaying two different mailboxes simultaneously. The examiner then uses "Official Notice" to show that putting different mailboxes side-by-side on a window using different browser instances has been widely practiced by Internet users. Indeed Evidence A of the previous office action serves as an evidentiary support for the Official Notice. If Applicant still has doubt, all he/she needs to do is try it with a nominal browser on a networked computer. Since the browser instances are created for different mailboxes at different instant of time, it is obvious that the connections are different because their target mailboxes are different.

For at least the above reasons, it is submitted that the prior art of record reads on the claims.

13. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

14. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

Examiner note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and
(571)273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

August 20, 2007


8/20/07